

REMARKS

This response is being filed in reply to a Communication from the Examiner dated June 16, 2005, in which certain informalities in the previously-submitted amendment affecting claims 1 and 24 are noted. These informalities were due to the inadvertent reintroduction of language in these claims that had been previously corrected by way of supplemental amendment. Through inadvertence, the correction of the recitation of “position” at line 3 of claims 1 and 24 to production was dropped and “position” was incorrectly reintroduced at line 3 of claims 1 and 24. These claims are amended again to correct this error and properly recite production at line 3 of claims 1 and 24.

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the above-identified application and remain for consideration.

Claims 3 and 12 are allowed.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 13-29 had previously been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking written description in the specification. This rejection had been respectfully traversed, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these arguments.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 13-29 had previously been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking enablement in the specification. This rejection had been respectfully traversed, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these arguments.

Reexamination of the application as amended, reconsideration of the rejections, and allowance of the claims not already allowed are respectfully requested.

The Communication of June 16, 2005 set a one-month period for response. Accordingly, this Response is being filed in a timely manner.

This response is being filed in accordance with recently revised 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, as set forth in 68 F.R. 38611 (June 30, 2003). If the amendment is considered to be not in compliance with recently revised 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at his earliest possible convenience.

This Response corrects the amendments previously made to claims 1 and 24. As indicated above, the previous amendment inadvertently reintroduced an error in line 3 of claim 1 and line 3 of claim 24 that recited "position" instead of production. This error is corrected in this amendment.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the arguments previously submitted and allow the claims as amended.

Date: July 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Michael B. Farber  
Michael B. Farber, Ph.D., Esq.

CATALYST LAW GROUP, APC  
4220 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 220  
San Diego, California 92122  
(858) 450-0099  
(858) 450-9834 (Fax)